

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Larry Darnell Green,	)	C/A No.0:09-3283-RBH-PJG
	)	
Petitioner	)	
	)	
vs.	)	<b>REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION</b>
	)	
South Carolina, State of,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	
_____	)	

The petitioner, Larry Darnell Green, proceeding *pro se*, brought this action seeking a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On May 26, 2010, the respondent filed a motion for summary judgment. (Docket Entry 22.) By order of this court filed May 27, 2010, pursuant to Roseboro v. Garrison, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), the petitioner was advised of the dismissal and summary judgment procedures and the possible consequences if he failed to respond adequately.<sup>1</sup> (Docket Entry 23.)

Notwithstanding the specific warning and instructions set forth in the court's Roseboro order, the petitioner failed to respond to the motion. As the petitioner is proceeding *pro se*, the court filed a second order on July 13, 2010, advising the petitioner that it appeared to the court that he was not opposing the motion and wished to abandon this action, and giving the petitioner an additional fourteen (14) days in which to file his response to the respondent's motion for summary judgment.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The court notes that the mailing containing this order was returned as undeliverable. (See Docket Entry 25.) The court further observes that the petitioner was specifically advised of his obligation to keep the court apprised of his current address and the consequences of failing to do so. (See Docket Entry 6.)


<sup>2</sup>The mailing containing this order was also returned as undeliverable. (See Docket Entry 29.)

(Docket Entry 26.) The petitioner was specifically warned that if he failed to respond, this action would be recommended for dismissal with prejudice for failure to prosecute. See Davis v. Williams, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

Despite this second warning, the petitioner still did not respond. Therefore, the petitioner meets all of the criteria for dismissal under Chandler Leasing Corp.v. Lopez, 669 F.2d 919 (4th Cir. 1982).<sup>3</sup>

### RECOMMENDATION

Accordingly, it is recommended that this action be dismissed with prejudice for lack of prosecution. See Davis, 558 F.2d at 70; Ballard v. Carlson, 882 F.2d 93, 95 (4th Cir. 1989) (stating that magistrate judge's prior explicit warning that a recommendation of dismissal would result from the petitioner failing to obey his order was proper grounds for the district court to dismiss the suit when the petitioner did not comply despite the warning), cert. denied sub nom, Ballard v. Volunteers of America, 493 U.S. 1084 (1990); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). In light of the court's recommendation, the court further recommends that any pending motions (Docket Entry 22) be terminated.

  
Paige J. Gossett  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

July 28, 2010  
Columbia, South Carolina

*The parties' attention is directed to the important notice on the next page.*

---

<sup>3</sup>He is personally responsible for proceeding in a dilatory fashion, the respondent is suffering prejudice by continuing to have these claims clouding its career and continuing to incur legal expenses, and no sanctions appear to exist other than dismissal given the previous warnings and extensions provided. Lopez, 669 F.2d at 920.

### **Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation**

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); see Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk  
United States District Court  
901 Richland Street  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

**Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation.** 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).